

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office) Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,528	11/13/2003	Mitesh B. Sheth	M09713	8668
7590 10/20/2004			EXAMINER	
William D. Lanyi, Esq.			AVILA, STEPHEN P	
Mercury Marine W6250 Pioneer Road			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. Box 1939			3617	
Fond du Lac, WI 54936-1939			DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summan	10/712,528	SHETH, MITESH B.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Stephen Avila	3617				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address~				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl' - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timey within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) daywill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 N	lovember 2003.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	s action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7,9-14 and 16-20</u> is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>8 and 15</u> is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	ar					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		•				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 111303.		atent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/712,528

Art Unit: 3617

1).

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sumigawa in view of List et al. Sumigawa discloses the basic claimed structure including a marine propulsion system with a first containment 16 and a second containment 30 (oil sump; note column 1, lines 15-17, column 4, line 1) and cooling water (note the Abstract, for example). Not disclosed by Sumigawa is a polymer oil sump. List et al teach a polymer oil sump (column 2, lines 38-41). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the device of Sumigawa with a polymer oil sump as taught by List et al for light weight. Additionally, to form the drive shaft housing 16 to be of aluminum would have been an obvious choice of engineering design to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for high strength and light weight.
- 3. Claims 4-6, 11-13, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sumigawa in view of List et al as applied to claims 1, 10, and 17 above, and further in view of Jones et al. Not disclosed by Sumigawa are the particular materials used. Jones et al teach an engine component of nylon reinforced with glass fibers (paragraph 0024). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the oil sump of Sumigawa of nylon reinforced with glass fibers as taught by Jones et al for high strength and light weight.

Art Unit: 3617

<u>ئ</u>

4. Claims 8 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5. In view of the papers filed 4/14/04, it has been found that this nonprovisional application, as filed, through error and without deceptive intent, improperly set forth the inventorship, and accordingly, this application has been corrected in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(a). The inventorship of this application has been changed by the addition of Steve Wynveen and Wesley R. Martin as inventors.

The application will be forwarded to the Office of Initial Patent Examination (OIPE) for issuance of a corrected filing receipt, and correction of Office records to reflect the inventorship as corrected.

6. This Office action restarts the shortened statutory period for response.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Avila whose telephone number is 703-308-2578. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 8 AM to 4 PM (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Samuel J. Morano can be reached on 703-308-0230. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3617

)

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Stephen Avila **Primary Examiner**

Art Unit 3617